

3. Remarks

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, and 14. The applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7, 8, and 14, and has cancelled claims 2, 3, and 6.

A. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 as being anticipated by Nagano. The applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. The Examiner has found claim 3 allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The applicant therefore asserts that the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is moot in light of this amendment. Claim 5 is dependent upon claim 1, and the applicant therefore asserts that claim 5 is allowable for the same reasons as presented for amended claim 1. Claims 2 and 6 have been cancelled.

The applicant has amended claim 1 as set forth herein strictly for purposes of advancing the prosecution of this application, and does not concede that the art cited by the Examiner is applicable to original claim 1 or any other claim.

B. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 14 as being unpatentable over Nagano in view of Tribelsky et al. Both claims 13 and 14 are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon amended claim 1, and the applicant therefore asserts that this basis of rejection is rendered moot by the amendment to claim 1 as presented

above. Again, the applicant has amended claim 1 as set forth herein strictly for purposes of advancing the prosecution of this application, and does not concede that the art cited by the Examiner is applicable to original claim 1 or any other claim.

C. Other Matters

Claims 4 and 7 have been amended because they were dependent upon claims that have been cancelled. Claim 7 has also been amended such that the nomenclature used in that claim is consistent with that of its new base claim.

Claim 8 has been amended such that it is now presented in independent form.

Claim 14 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

D. Duplicate Office action

It appears that the Office action of January 19, 2006, was an inadvertent duplicate mailing of the Office action of January 13, 2006. This response is therefore submitted as a response to both Office actions.


E. Conclusion

With the amendments made herein and for the reasons provided above, the applicant asserts that all claims remaining in the application are allowable as amended, and reconsideration and allowance is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4-21-2006

Reg. No. 41,715
Telephone: (501) 371-0808
Facsimile: (501) 376-9442
Customer No.: 47990

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chr M", is written over a horizontal line.

J. Charles Dougherty
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings LLP
200 W. Capitol Avenue
Suite 2300
Little Rock, AR 72201-3699